REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25, and 26 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 18, 22, and 23 are currently amended. Claim 26 has been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, and 25 are now pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered. Applicants respectfully request non-entry of the After-Final Amendment dated May 18, 2009.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,820,082 (hereinafter "Cook") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,999,972 (hereinafter "Lusen") and U.S. Patent No. 5,899,991 (hereinafter "Karch").

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25, and 26 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Cook, Lusen, and Karch. Applicants respectfully submit that Cook, Lusen, and Karch, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25, and 26. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25, and 26 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, the Office Action fails to correctly ascertain the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art and its accompanying rejections should be withdrawn.

Cook, Lusen, and Karch, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the method recited in amended claim 1. For example, amended claim 1 recites a method for searching electronic records stored in a common repository in a database that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users associated with the database. As recited, information is received indicative of a set of one or more application events that, upon occurrence, cause a first set of one or more computer systems to intercept database transactions

instantiated by database applications with a database management system of the database and to generate electronic records from data in underlying database tables associated with execution of operations by the database applications identified in the database transactions. As recited, a plurality of electronic records are stored where each electronic record comprises a well-formed XML document stored in a character large-object (CLOB) format in a column of a table of the database. As recited, electronic records are created based on mappings between underlying database tables associated with execution of operations by the database applications and the plurality of electronic records in response to occurrence of the set of one or more application events. Applicants respectfully submit that Cook, Lusen, and Karch, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the method recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 10 and 18 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 1, 10, and 18 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62173626 v1

OID-2003-066-01